



Stratford on Avon District Council

Planning Application Local List

Consultation responses

The Council undertook a consultation on its revised Local List which ran for 6 weeks. A total of 14 responses were received. Two responses were from Planning Agents, and twelve responses were from consultees.

Following these responses, the following amendments have been made:

- Additional information in respect of bin collection points.
- Additional information included with regards to required information related to Listed Building Consent Applications.
- Additional information included with regards to requirements of Structural Surveys where they related to the Structure of a Listed Building.
- Further clarity included with regards to Contaminated Land Assessment Requirements.
- Additional requirement included with regards to Surface Water Drainage Strategies.
- Additional text relating to Air Quality Impact Assessments.
- Additional information regarding Street Trees (including policy justification).
- Clarification of requirements with regards to Biodiversity Net Gain
- Additional clarification with regards to LVIA requirements.

In respect of other comments made as a result of the consultation, the following detailed matters were raised and have been taken into account by the Council as follows.:

Concerns raised regarding the inclusion of a requirement for a BNG Statement to include how the BNG hierarchy/ trading rules will be followed accords with NPPG/ NPPF.

As referred to in the Local List, Paragraph Ref ID 74-002-20240214 of the NPPG sets out
“Specifically, prior to the submission of a relevant planning application, applicants are

encouraged to consider biodiversity net gain early in the development process and factor it into site selection and design. Where appropriate, they should discuss the biodiversity net gain requirements for their development upfront with the relevant local planning authority utilising any pre-application advice services offered by them. This could help establish whether development proposals would be subject to biodiversity net gain and, if they are, enable feedback on the proposed strategy for achieving the biodiversity gain objective and consideration of the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy to inform the design of the proposals. ” As such, requiring this information as part of the submission of an application ensures the LPA is able to understand how the site will be capable of achieving onsite BNG.

Impact upon requirement to demonstrate adherence with trading rules on SME's.

It is noted in the response that reference is made to the Government's intentions to amend the biodiversity gain hierarchy for minor development so that offsite biodiversity gains are given the same preference as onsite habitat creation or enhancement. However, it is noted that this has not yet come forward, however, it is not considered that the local list requirements for a BNG Statement would prejudice any applications that may be subject to the revised BNG requirements. This is insofar that the exemptions would still apply, and any requirements within the updated legislation relating can be demonstrated within the BNG Statement. However, the concerns are noted, and to ensure that the inclusion of this in the Local List remains flexible, additional text has been added to include for potential future amendments to legislation.

Inclusion of requirement for details of Implementation, maintenance, monitoring and funding for 30 years.

This aligns with the requirements for full planning applications, and as such additional text has been included requiring this information for Full applications and Reserved Matters Applications.

Exempt Sites Requirements

Concerns noted with regards to the additional burden for SME's in having to produce a metric where not required under BNG Legislation. As such, this requirement has been deleted. A statement will still be required to accord with Policy CS.6 to show where enhancement opportunities can be taken.

BREEAM Pre-assessment certification

Comments were included regarding the necessity of the BREEAM requirements. This accords with Policy CS.2 of the Core Strategy and as such no amendments made.

Request to delete Construction Management Plans

This information is necessary to enable assessment of the construction impacts of a development, particularly in respect of highways.

Request to delete Contaminated Land Desktop Study/ Remediation Statement

Policy CS.9 of the Core Strategy requires that proposals will ensure a good standard of space and amenity for occupiers. Occupants of new and neighbouring buildings will be protected from unacceptable levels of noise, contamination and pollution, loss of daylight and privacy, and adverse surroundings. As such retention of this requirement is considered reasonable.

Concern raised regarding the vagueness of the requirement for a Green Belt Statement –

It is considered that requiring a statement on proposals which are inappropriate development in the Green Belt is clear when considered against the requirements of policy CS.10 of the Core Strategy.

Landscaping Details (hard & soft)

Concerns were raised that the list of requirements in this regard is extremely lengthy, onerous and expensive for an applicant, especially for smaller sites. It is asserted that such great detail is not required at validation stage to reach a decision. Part L Development Requirements SPD sets out that *“The landscape scheme must be addressed during the early stages, ideally at the pre-application stage, of developments and be integral to the design of the whole of the proposal.”* As such the inclusion of these requirements are considered to be supported by policy.

Concerns raised regarding requirement for lighting schemes and assessment

It is not a requirement for all applications and as such, it is reasonable and flexible.